<u>R e m a r k s</u>

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. The Examiner states that the references incorporated in the specification at page 6, lines 17-21 should be submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (Sync-MS: Synchronized Messaging Service for Real-time Multi-Player Distributed Games, hereinafter "Lin").

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Any amendments to any claim for reasons other than as expressly recited herein as being for the purpose of distinguishing such claim from known prior art are not being made with an intent to change in any way the literal scope of such claims or the range of equivalents for such claims. They are being made simply to present language that is better in conformance with the form requirements of Title 35 of the United States Code or is simply clearer and easier to understand than the originally presented language. Any amendments to any claim expressly made in order to distinguish such claim from known prior art are being made only with an intent to change the literal scope of such claim in the most minimal way, i.e., to just avoid the prior art in a way that leaves the claim novel and not obvious in view of the cited prior art, and no equivalent of any subject matter remaining in the claim is intended to be surrendered.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an

636458-1

independent claim has been rewriting to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code.

Applicants have amended on pages 2 and 6 by removing the respective hyperlinks.

The Examiner states that the references incorporated in the specification at page 6, lines 17-21 should be submitted in an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS).

A web-based article relating to the release of the game, Quake, (e.g., see page 6 of the specification) has been submitted in an IDS. The Bernier article cited on page 2 of the specification is also included in the IDS.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (Sync-MS: Synchronized Messaging Service for Real-time Multi-Player Distributed Games, hereinafter "Lin"). The rejection is traversed.

Dependent claims 7 and 24-27 have been amended to correct respective typographical mistakes.

Independent claims 1 and 22 have been amended to clarify Applicants' invention. The amended claims recite, in part:

> "delivering said action messages for processing by said game server in an order of increasing reaction time <u>without clock synchronization among said game server and said players</u>, reaction time being a difference between reception of an update message by a player and a sending of an action message by said player in response to said update message." (emphasis added)

The amended claim is fully supported by the original specification, e.g., page 10, lines 6-9. As such, no new matter has been added.

636458-1

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim. The Lin reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed invention, as arranged in independent claim 1.

Specifically, the method of Lin requires that the clocks at the game server and all player stations be synchronized. For example, on p. 2, section 1.1, third paragraph, Lin teaches that "[p]layer action fairness means that the game server will process action messages from all player stations in a fair order based on their real-time occurrence[1]." which, as noted in footnote 1, requires synchronized clocks. Furthermore, on p 3, left column, Lin teaches that "[w]e assume that hosts and routers have synchronized clocks using Network Time Protocol (NTP) [12] or Global Positioning Systems (GPS)."

Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest at least the following feature recited in independent claim 1 or claim 22: "delivering said action messages for processing by said game server in an order of increasing reaction time without clock synchronization among said game server and said players."

As such, the amended claims 1 and 22 are not anticipated by Lin and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 102.

As for independent claim 19, the Examiner cited Lin's Fig. 2 and p. 3, col. 2, par. 2 as allegedly teaching the following features of claim 19:

> "receiving an update message from said game server at a player proxy;
> recording reception time of said update message at said player proxy; and
> calculating a reaction time using said reception time, said reaction time
> transmitted by a player in connection with an action message."

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As set forth above, Lin teaches the use of synchronized clocks for the game server and the player stations. Lin further teaches (on p. 3, bottom of left column to top of right column) a Sync-out mechanism for synchronized delivery of state update messages to the player stations through the Sync-MS Client (SMCs). The Sync-out mechanism results in an update message U_1 being delivered at Player Stations 1 and 2 at the same time, as shown in Fig. 2. Based on the sending time of action message A_2 from Player Station 2 being closer to the arrival time of update message U_1 compared to that of A_1 from Player

Station 1, Lin is able to deduce that Player 2 reacts to the same update faster than Player 1 (p. 3, right column, second paragraph).

In Lin, however, the reaction time is deduced based on the synchronized arrival time of the update message <u>at the respective Play Stations 1 and 2</u>. This arrival time is <u>not the reception time of the update message at the respective SMCs</u>, and there is no teaching in Lin regarding any calculation or estimation of reaction times of Player 1 or 2 using the arrival times of update message U_1 at SMC_1 and SMC_2.

Thus, Lin does not teach at least the features of "recording reception time of said update message at said player proxy; and calculating a reaction time using said reception time, said reaction time transmitted by a player in connection with an action message," as provided in Applicants' claim 19.

As such, claim 19 is not anticipated by the teaching of Lin.

Since all of the dependent claims that depend from the independent claims include all the limitations of the respective independent claims from which they ultimately depend, each such dependent claim is also allowable over Lin under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _12/30/07_

Eamon J. Wall
Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

636458-1